

Ronald S. Caswell (Cal. Bar No. 161113)
rscaswell@sbcglobal.net
CASWELL & CANNON
1625 Warnall Avenue, Suite 100
Los Angeles, California 90024
Telephone: (310) 282-8150
Facsimile: (310) 282-8140

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Don A. Hernandez (Cal. Bar No. 125119)
Don_Hernandez@gshllp.com
Cristina D. Hernandez (Cal. Bar No. 283500)
Cristina_Hernandez@gshllp.com
GONZALEZ SAGGIO & HARLAN LLP
2 North Lake Avenue, Suite 930
Pasadena, CA 91101
Telephone: (626) 440-0022
Facsimile: (626) 792-1718

Attorneys for Defendants

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, LOS
ANGELES FIRE & POLICE PENSION
ex rel MARCELLUS TAYLOR,

Plaintiff,

vs.

DEUTSCHE BANK, AG, *et al.*,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:15-cv-05343-RGK-RAOx

**RULE 26(f) JOINT SCHEDULING
REPORT**

Judge: Hon. R. Gary Klausner
Date: November 23, 2015
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Ctrm: 850

1 Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f), Civil Local Rule 26-1, and the
2 August 13, 2015 Order Setting Scheduling Conference (Dkt. No. 20), the parties
3 have conferred and jointly submit this Rule 26(f) Joint Scheduling Report.

4 **I. NATURE OF THE CASE AND CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES**

5 **A. Plaintiff's Statement**

6 This *qui tam* action stems from Deutsche Bank's orchestration of a massive,
7 ongoing "pay-to-play" securities fraud perpetrated on Los Angeles Fire & Police
8 Pension ("LAFP"). At all relevant times, Deutsche Bank owned a controlling
9 interest in a now-defunct private equity consulting firm called Aldus Equity
10 Partners ("Aldus"). In this role, Deutsche Bank systematically defrauded LAFP by
11 recommending that LAFP invest \$355 million into various private equity funds not
12 because those funds were wise investments for LAFP, but instead to enrich
13 Deutsche Bank and its network of corrupt, politically-connected "placement
14 agents."

15 Marcellus Taylor, a former Aldus partner and an original source of the
16 allegations alleged in the Complaint, cooperated extensively with state and federal
17 government agencies investigating "pay-to-play" securities fraud in New York and
18 New Mexico. That cooperation was instrumental in any public disclosures that
19 have taken place to date. As for the claims alleged in the Complaint, Deutsche
20 Bank's role in the fraud perpetrated on LAFP has never before been publicly
21 disclosed. Nor has any prior litigation been brought to hold Deutsche Bank
22 accountable for the harm it has caused to LAFP.

23 Despite its continued claims of ignorance of the fraudulent scheme, Mr.
24 Taylor has personal knowledge that Deutsche Bank actively participated in the
25 fraud on LAFP, and worked closely with Aldus' corrupt founding partner to
26 maximize profits for Deutsche Bank at the expense of LAFP even after Deutsche
27 Bank learned (from Mr. Taylor) that that partner had accepted an illegal kickback
28

1 from one of Deutsche Bank's own placement agents. Mr. Taylor's personal
2 knowledge is detailed in a Complaint that names the specific Deutsche Bank
3 executives involved in the fraud, the specific fraudulent investments Deutsche
4 Bank recommended to LAFP, and the amounts of damages caused by those
5 investments.

6 **B. Defendant's Statement**

7 This is the third lawsuit filed by Marcellus Taylor against Deutsche Bank,
8 each with similar claims and based on the same underlying facts. (The other two
9 have been dismissed by federal and state courts in Texas and New Mexico.)
10 Taylor was a partner in the now defunct firm Aldus Equity Partners ("Aldus"), a
11 private equity consulting firm that Los Angeles Fire & Police Pensions ("LAFP")
12 hired to recommend investments for its private equity portfolio. Taylor alleges that
13 one of his partners in the Aldus firm was corrupt and that he knew it but never
14 brought that misconduct to the attention of his client LAFP at the time. He alleges
15 now that Aldus breached its fiduciary duty to LAFP by recommending sub-par
16 investment products that were allegedly chosen to enrich placement agents who
17 were part of a corrupt arrangement with his former partner. He purports to bring
18 this action in a representative capacity on behalf of LAFP (which has declined to
19 intervene), but with the incentive that under the California False Claims Act (Cal.
20 Gov. Code §§ 12650-56, the "CFCA"), he stands to make a bounty of up to 50%
21 for himself if he is successful. Deutsche Bank was a minority investor in Aldus
22 between 2007 and 2009, and Taylor seeks to hold Deutsche Bank liable for
23 Aldus's alleged misconduct.

24 Taylor is not a whistleblower such as the CFCA was designed to reward.
25 Since 2009, Aldus's possible involvement in pay-to-play practices has been the
26 focal point of governmental investigations by the SEC, the FBI, the New York
27 Attorney General, state authorities in New Mexico, and the LAFP itself. It has also
28

1 been the subject of much litigation, including a federal enforcement proceeding
 2 against Aldus by the SEC, a suit against Taylor himself (among others) by the New
 3 Mexico Educational Retirement Board, and additional claims brought by other
 4 private parties. Deutsche Bank's investment in Aldus was also well known and
 5 publicly disclosed, and numerous prior lawsuits over the last five years have
 6 sought (unsuccessfully) to hold Deutsche Bank responsible for Aldus's
 7 misconduct. This case follows on the heels of all of these well-publicized
 8 investigations and allegations, yet Taylor claims to have discovered the alleged
 9 fraud. As set forth in more detail in Deutsche Bank's motion to dismiss, Taylor's
 10 claims are precluded by the CFCA's public disclosure bar, the statute of
 11 limitations, and Taylor's failure to plead fraud with particularity.

12 On the merits, Deutsche Bank maintains that it was unaware of any
 13 misconduct by Aldus or any of its partners until the New York Attorney General
 14 was investigating the matter, and that it would never have bought a stake in Aldus
 15 (a transaction in which it lost its entire \$28 million investment) if it had been aware
 16 of such facts.

17 **II. MATTERS TO BE ADDRESSED UNDER RULE 26(f)**

18 **A. Timing and Form of Rule 26(a) Disclosures**

19 **1. Rule 26(a)(1) disclosures**

20 The parties agree to exchange Rule 26(a)(1) initial disclosures by December
 21 4, 2015.

22 **B. Discovery and Pretrial Plan**

23 Deutsche Bank has already moved twice to dismiss this case, and,
 24 particularly since all of Taylor's earlier cases against Deutsche Bank have also
 25 been dismissed, it does not believe that the parties should have to incur the sizable
 26 cost of discovery unless the case survives the threshold legal challenge to the
 27 sufficiency of Taylor's claims. Deutsche Bank's second motion to dismiss is fully
 28

1 briefed and the Court has taken the motion under submission. Deutsche Bank
2 proposes that discovery (other than Rule 26(a)(1) initial disclosures) should be
3 stayed until the motion to dismiss is decided.

4 Taylor believes that party and non-party discovery should begin as soon as
5 possible.

6 The parties agree that fact discovery should take 12 months from the date
7 when it commences.

8 **D. Electronically Stored Information (“ESI”)**

9 The parties state that they have taken reasonable, good-faith steps to
10 preserve potentially relevant ESI as required under the Federal Rules of Civil
11 Procedure.

12 **E. Privilege and Protective Order**

13 The parties plan to submit to the Court a stipulated protective order
14 concerning treatment of confidential information.

15 **F. Additional Limitations on Discovery**

16 The parties agree that no changes should be made in the limitations on
17 discovery imposed under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules
18 of the Central District of California.

19 **III. MATTERS TO BE ADDRESSED UNDER LOCAL RULE 26-1**

20 **A. Complex Cases**

21 The parties agree that this is not a complex case under Local Rule 26-1(a).

22 **B. Dispositive or Partially Dispositive Motions**

23 The parties agree that summary judgment motions should be due 45 days
24 after the close of discovery.

1 **C. ADR**

2 The parties agree to proceed with ADR Procedure No. 3, under L.R. 16-
3 15.4, by participating in a private dispute resolution proceeding within 9 months
4 after the commencement of discovery.

5 **D. Trial Estimate**

6 The parties estimate that trial will take 8 days.

7 **E. Additional Parties**

8 Deutsche Bank does not intend to join any additional parties.

9 Taylor wishes to reserve the right to join additional parties (other than
10 Deutsche Bank-affiliated persons and entities), and agrees that any motion seeking
11 leave to join additional parties shall be filed no later than 3 months after the
12 commencement of discovery. Deutsche Bank reserves the right to oppose any such
13 motion.

14 **F. Expert Witnesses**

15 The parties agree to exchange Rule 26(a)(2) disclosures 10 months after the
16 commencement of discovery.

17 Respectfully submitted,

18
19 **CASWELL & CANNON**

20 By: /s/ Ronald S. Caswell
21 Ronald S. Caswell (Cal. Bar No. 161113)
22 rscaswell@sbcglobal.net
23 1625 Warnall Avenue, Suite 100
24 Los Angeles, California 90024
25 Telephone: (310) 282-8150
26 Facsimile: (310) 282-8140
27
28

COWLES AND THOMPSON PC

Todd J Harlow (*admitted pro hac vice*)
901 Main Street, Suite 3900
Dallas, Texas 75202
Telephone: (214) 672-2138
Facsimile: (214) 672-2338
tharlow@cowlesthompson.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

GONZALEZ SAGGIO & HARLAN LLP

By: *Cristina D. Hernandez*_____
Don A. Hernandez (Cal. Bar No. 125119)
Don_Hernandez@gshllp.com
Cristina D. Hernandez (Cal. Bar No.
283500)
Cristina_Hernandez@gshllp.com
2 North Lake Avenue, Suite 930
Pasadena, CA 91101
Telephone: (626) 440-0022
Facsimile: (626) 792-1718

**FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS, SHRIVER
& JACOBSON LLP**

Peter L. Simmons (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Samuel P. Groner (*admitted pro hac vice*)
One New York Plaza
New York, New York 10004-1980
Telephone: (212) 859-8000
Facsimile: (212) 859-4000
peter.simmons@friedfrank.com
samuel.groner@friedfrank.com

Attorneys for Defendants